

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding grounds of rejection are respectfully requested in light of the above proposed amendments and the remarks that follow.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8 and 10-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Wetzler (U.S. 2,938,333) in view of Glezer et al. (U.S. 6,098,397), hereinafter Glezer.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has made certain fundamental errors in the interpretation of the subject matter contained in the references. For example, the Examiner contends that each protrusion 60 in Wetzler extends "continuously about a circumference of said liner."

In fact, Wetzler discloses at best a plurality of protrusions 60 extending about the circumference of the liner. It is readily apparent from Figure 4 that each protrusion 60 is a discrete generally rectangular, cup-like dimple that extends only within the confines of a respective set of four bolts 54. Under no circumstances can Wetzler be interpreted as disclosing that each of the protrusions 60 extends continuously about the circumference of the liner.

With respect to Glezer, the Examiner characterizes the concavities 84 as "grooves." Concavities 84 are nothing more than circular dimples and cannot under any reasonable interpretation, be regarded as "grooves" (see especially Figures 7 and 8 of Glezer).

In any event, applicant proposes to amend independent claim 1 to require that each groove have a uniform cross-section and that each groove extend continuously about the circumference of the liner. To the extent the Examiner may regard an entire row of discrete protrusions 60 in Wetzler as a groove that extends continuously about the liner, then it is also readily apparent that the groove does not have a uniform cross-section since each of the protrusions 60 has its own cup-like shape. Similarly, to the extent the Examiner interprets Glezer as disclosing a plurality of circular dimples which collectively are considered a groove (an incorrect interpretation in any event), then that "groove" also does not have a uniform cross-section.

It is readily apparent, therefore, that absent the utilization of impermissible hindsight gained from applicant's own disclosure, the combination of Wetzler and Glezer clearly fails to render obvious the subject matter of claim 1 or any of claims 2-6 and 8 that depend therefrom. Moreover, to the extent that claims 2-6 and 8 further define the continuous grooves, the combination of references also fails to disclose any of the limitations contained in those claims.

With respect to independent claim 10, neither Wetzler nor Glezer discloses a groove extending continuously about the circumference of the liner wherein the grooves are semi-circular in cross-section based on a diameter D , and wherein the depth of the grooves is equal to about 0.05 to 0.5 D . In this regard, claim 10 has been amended slightly to clarify that the diameter D has reference to the semi-circular cross-section of the groove and not to any external shape, for example, as in the diameter of a discrete

dimple or as in the diameter of the liner per se. In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to Figure 4 wherein the diameter D is indicated in a manner consistent with the amendment to claim 10.

It follows that the subject matter of claims 11-15 is also neither disclosed nor suggested in the combination of references applied by the Examiner.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by Hadder (U.S. 6,530,225).

By this response, applicant proposes to amend independent claim 9 to require that the first and second plurality of axially spaced circumferential grooves are smoothly curved in cross-section.

The Examiner is apparently relying on the embodiment illustrated in Figure 3 of Hadder with the waffle pattern disclosed in Figure 2 applied in Figure 3 such that the concavities face a surrounding outer cylinder. However, it is readily apparent from the cross-section of the waffle pattern shown in Figure 4 that the grooves do not have a smoothly curved cross-section but rather, are defined by flat inclined side surfaces connected to a flat bottom surface. Accordingly, the Hadder patent fails to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter of independent claim 9.

New claims 16 is similar to claim 9 but claims only the combustor liner. It is patentable for the same reasons as presented above with respect to claim 9.

The application is now in condition for allowance, and early passage to issue is respectfully requested. In the event, however, any small matters remain outstanding, the

BUNKER


Appl. No. 10/065,495

June 28, 2004

Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned so that the prosecution of this application can be expeditiously concluded.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: 
Michael J. Keenan
Reg. No. 32,106

MJK:ljb

1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor

Arlington, VA 22201-4714

Telephone: (703) 816-4000

Facsimile: (703) 816-4100